

REMARKS

This paper responds to the Office Action dated June 29, 2004. Enclosed please find Form PTO-2038 and Form PTO/SB/22.

Abstract. The Examiner objects to the Abstract. A new Abstract is provided which is tied more closely to the claims of this divisional application.

Claim amendments. One of the claims has been amended to correct typographical errors that were caused by the USPTO's faulty PASAT e-filing software.

Art rejection. The Examiner has rejected all claims as supposedly obvious over a two-way combination of US pat. no. 5649221 to Crawford et al. And US pat. no. 6708311 to Burstis.

So far as the undersigned can discern, Crawford merely stands for the notion of having a dictionary and Burstis merely stands for the notion of having a glossary. Neither reference, so far as the undersigned can see, has anything to do with searching.

Claim 1 is:

A method for use with a system **storing digital media records**, the system comprising a **vocabulary file of words keyed to the digital media records**, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving a search query by computer from a user, the search query including words;

logging the search query by computer, yielding a query log;

processing the query log to identify words in the query log which are not words already included in the vocabulary file and which are not words which are variants of words already included in the vocabulary file, the processing performed by computer, said words defined as "not-found words;"

adding the not-found words to the vocabulary file, and

keying the not-found words to the digital media records.

The undersigned has diligently studied each of the two cited references and is unable to find the limitations that are shown in bold text above. The Examiner admits that this limitation is nowhere found in Crawford. What would remain is for the Examiner to find these limitations in Burstis, but the undersigned is unable to find those limitations in Burstis. The Examiner is requested to indicate, by page and line number, the place where these limitations may be found in Burstis, or alternatively to allow the claim.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and should be allowed for the same reasons.

Reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl Oppedahl
PTO Reg. No. 32,746
Oppedahl & Larson LLP
P O Box 5068
Dillon, CO 80435-5068
telephone 970-468-6600

